



Docket No.: 8733.561.00-US
(PATENT)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:

Hong Suk Yoo et al.

Confirmation No.: 7762

Application No.: 10/026,477

Art Unit: 2871

Filed: December 27, 2001

Examiner: Timothy L. Rude

For: LIQUID CRYSTAL DISPLAY DEVICE AND
METHOD FOR MANUFACTURING THE
SAME

Customer No.: 30827

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

MS AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In response to the Final Office Action dated July 13, 2004, Applicant respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 15-25 in view of the remarks presented herein below.

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 15-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,133,967 to Moon ("Moon"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

In order to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103, the Office Action must set forth a *prima facie* case of obviousness. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some motivation or suggestion to modified the applied reference. Second there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the reference must teach each and every claimed element. (See MPEP §2143) In the present case, claims 15-22 are not properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 because the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

In rejecting independent claim 15, from which claims 16-22 variously depend, the Examiner asserts that although Moon fails to disclose a first insulating layer formed on an entire